

REMARKS

The office action of June 24, 2009, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 5, 7 and 9 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c).

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hatton et al.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hatton et al. in view of the patent to Yamamura et al.

In view of the Examiner's objection to and rejections of the claims, applicant has canceled claims 8 and 9, and amended claims 1, 3, 5 and 7.

Applicant has amended the claims to correct the informalities pointed out by the Examiner. In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the objection to claims 5, 7 and 9 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims now on file particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims to address the instances of indefiniteness pointed out by the Examiner.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, in view of the amendments to claim 1 applicant submits that the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the methods disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references and particularly to Hatton, et al., it can be seen that this reference discloses compositions that can be used as adhesives, primers for adhesives, laminating and casting resins, molding compositions, putties and sealing compounds, potting and insulating compounds for the electronic industry, but especially as coatings (see e.g. page 13, 4th paragraph). In accordance with this, in the examples of the reference only a bonded joint (example 14) and a coating (example 15) are mentioned. There is nothing in the teachings of this reference that suggests to one skilled in the art that these compositions would have any of the properties that are imperative for using the compositions in the production of wire coils. There is no teaching concerning the production of wire coils, as recited in the claims presently on file.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-9 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the above-discussed reference is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Yamamura et al. discloses compositions for forming three-dimensional objects by photo-fabricating, i.e. the compositions are applied, then exposed to light and after that,

any uncured parts are washed away so that a three-dimensional object results. There is no teaching concerning the producing of wire coils as recited in the claims presently on file.

The Examiner combined Yamamura et al. with Hatton et al. in determining that claims 10 and 11 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant respectfully submits that neither of these references, nor their combination, a method for producing a wire coil as recited in the claims presently on file.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Kwiecinski discloses solderable enamels for electronic applications. As such, the compositions described therein need to have specific properties that are able to fulfill the demands the art places on solderable compositions. These demands, however, are completely different from those that a baking enamel for producing coils presents. Quite to the contrary, as solderable compositions should retract from the heated locations, Kwiecinski teaches away from using his compositions for

producing coils. Thus, Kwiecinski gives no suggestion for producing a wire coil as recited in the claims now on file.

The Examiner combined Kwiecinski with Hatton et al. in determining that claim 13 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant respectfully submits that neither of these references, nor their combination, a method for producing a wire coil as recited in the claims presently on file.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,



FI-82

By

Klaus P. Stoffel
Reg. No. 31,668
For: Friedrich Kueffner
Reg. No. 29,482
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910
New York, New York 10017
(212) 986-3114

Dated: September 24, 2009

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 24, 2009.

By:

Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: September 24, 2009